



Joan Marsh
Vice President –
Federal Regulatory

AT&T Services, Inc.
1120 20th Street, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036

202.457.3120 Phone
832.213.0172 Fax
joanmariemarsh@att.com

June 25, 2012

VIA ECFS

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: WT Docket No. 07-293; IB Docket No. 95-91; GEN Docket No. 90-357
WT Docket No. 10-112;
WT Docket No. 12-69;
WT Docket No. 10-4

NOTICE OF ORAL EX PARTE PRESENTATION

Dear Ms. Dortch,

On Thursday, June 21, 2012, the undersigned met with Ruth Milkman, Chief of the FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau. During the course of the meeting, we discussed a variety of issues.

First, we discussed the joint submission by AT&T and Sirius XM as filed on June 15, 2012 in WT Docket No. 07-293, IB Docket No. 95-91, and GEN Docket No. 90-357. I explained that if the proposals as submitted are adopted by the Commission, AT&T intends to invest the capital and resources necessary to rationalize its WCS spectrum for a mobile broadband LTE network deployment. I also indicated that deploying mobile broadband service over WCS would end the significant underutilization of the band, which has persisted since the Commission allocated the spectrum 15 years ago.

I also discussed the filing AT&T made resolving concerns expressed by AFTRCC regarding use of the upper WCS bands and AT&T's commitment to an ongoing dialogue with AFTRCC on coordination issues. Finally, I discussed the need for the FCC to resolve the issue of competing applications as has been noticed and briefed in the pending license renewal proceeding in WT Docket No. 10-112.

Second, we discussed AT&T's position in the pending 700 MHz interoperability proceeding. I argued that AT&T's opening comments fully demonstrate that the interference challenges in the lower 700 MHz band are real and material. The high power broadcasts permitted in broadcast TV Channel 51 and in the 700 MHz lower E block create the potential for debilitating interference into the lower A and B blocks that

could dramatically degrade wireless service. I also argued that a Band 12 mandate would fall far short of solving the real challenges crippling the A block. Namely, among other deficiencies, a mandate would do nothing to eliminate the Channel 51 exclusion zones, areas where A block carriers simply cannot deploy. These no-build zones make efficient use of the A block virtually impossible.

I further indicated that AT&T is committed to finding real solutions to the lower A block challenges and we discussed some of the ideas AT&T presented in its opening comments as filed in the proceeding.

Finally, we discussed the pending inquiry into appropriate rules for the use of signal boosters and the various proposals that have been made on the record. While I took no position on the pending proposals, I noted that if new rules are adopted, the Commission should also adopt a rigorous enforcement regime.

In accordance with Commission rules, this letter is being filed electronically with your office for inclusion in the public record.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Joan Marsh', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Joan Marsh

cc: Ruth Milkman